

| | | |
|--------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|
| Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
| | 10/786,068 | NOZAWA ET AL. |
| | Examiner Gina M. Lupino | Art Unit 3652 |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Gina M. Lupino. (3) Tim McAnulty.
 (2) Saul Rodriguez. (4) Chris Agrawal.

Date of Interview: 30 August 2007.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
 c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-7 and 12-17.

Identification of prior art discussed: Sundar (U.S. Patent 6,327,517).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The Examiner notes the following:

- 1) The Examiner has interpreted "a linear transfer path" in the Sundar reference as any one of the numerous paths a wafer may follow as it is moved through this system. This includes either the linear path the wafer traces as it is moved along a straight line from within to outside of the loadlock, or otherwise along a longer, continuous path from within the loadlock to any subsequent position in the system, such as within a processing chamber.
- 2) The Examiner has interpreted "a carry-in route" as the general path a wafer follows as it is moved along the direction from any point outside of the processing system, through the loadlock, and to any point within the system. Thus, a detecting mechanism stationed "along" this carry-in-route is a sensor positioned at any point along this entire route, including at the interface between the loadlock and transfer chamber.
- 3) The relative position between the wafer and table may be determined while considering the location of the table relative to the loadlock.
- 4) Claim 1 contains numerous structural amendments. The Examiner conducted a new search to find prior art that includes these limitations. Thus, the Examiner upholds the finality of the final office action.